

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated January 5, 2009 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1-11, 13-30 and 32-38 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 13-30, and 32-38 are rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0019825 by Smiga et al. (hereinafter “Smiga”) and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0178022 by Anderson et al. (hereinafter “Anderson”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections, and respectfully submit that the claims as originally filed are not rendered obvious in view of the combination of Smiga and Anderson. However, in order to facilitate prosecution of the application and in a bona fide attempt to advance the application to allowance, the Applicants present this response with amendment to clarify particular aspects of the claimed invention.

For example, independent Claim 1 has been amended to recite information is associated multi-dimensionally into at least two different categories according to information type and at least one other criterion, including location information identified by a place name. A portable data processor determines context information associated with a location of the portable data processor in a radio system, and a reminder is carried in a user interface concerning a stored association associated with the place name based on the determined location. Independent Claim 20 has been similarly amended. These amendments are fully supported in the Specification as filed (e.g., paragraphs 0025, 0026, and 0036-0044) and no new matter has been added.

The combination of Smiga and Anderson fails to teach or suggest the use of place names and location determination as set forth in the claims. Smiga describes “natural language parsing to identify keywords” that are linked to “projects, contacts, date/time events, lists, and document identifier objects.” (Smiga, 0034). While Smiga describe a user-defined type of information such as “GPS location” at 0194, nowhere does Smiga describe any specific examples where GPS location is associated with processed

information. Further, the term “GPS location,” as known and used in the relevant art, describes a latitude/longitude or other numerical representation of location, and cannot be reasonably construed to teach a place name (e.g., “work” and “home” as described in the present Specification) as set forth in the amended claims.

Anderson fails to remedy the deficiencies of Smiga in this regard. Anderson describes a context interpreter 110 to “determine where a user is likely to be, what the user is likely to be doing, how available the user is likely to be to various persons and/or what resources are available for communication with the user.” (Anderson, 0021). Anderson describes tracking a user’s location based on GPS, network address, and wireless signals (Anderson, 0022 and 0047). However, the only use made of this location data is “limit where and/or when such information is provided,” “making determinations as to the best way to reach that person,” and as input to event detector 112 (Anderson, 0023 and 0025). However, nowhere does Anderson teach or suggest that location information identified by a place name is processed based on commands obtained from a user interface in a portable data processor. Nor does Anderson teach or suggest carrying out a reminder in a user interface of a portable data processor concerning a stored association associated with the place name based on a location determined by the portable data processor.

For at least these reasons, the Smiga/Anderson combination fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, these claims are allowable over the cited combination of references. Also, because dependent Claims 2-11, 13-19, 21-30, and 32-38 depend from Claims 1 and 20, respectively, these claims are also allowable over the Smiga/Anderson combination.

The Applicants respectfully submit that a detailed discussion of each of the Examiner’s rejections beyond that provided above is not necessary, in view of the clear absence of teaching and suggestion of various features recited in the Applicant’s pending Claims 1 and 20. Accordingly, it is to be understood that where the Applicants have not addressed particular points in the Office Action, this should not be construed as acquiesce to the Examiner’s characterization of the asserted art or the Applicant’s claimed subject matter, nor of the Examiner’s application of the asserted art or combinations thereof to the

Applicant's claimed subject matter Nor do the Applicants acquiesce to any explicit or implicit statements or conclusions by the Examiner concerning what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, obvious design choices, alternative equivalent arrangements, common knowledge at the time of the Applicant's invention, officially noticed facts, and the like. The Applicants, however, reserve the right to address in detail the Examiner's characterizations, conclusions, and rejections in future prosecution.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NKO.008.US) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,
HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South, Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 55425
952.854.2700

Date: April 30, 2009

By: /William B. Ashley/

William B. Ashley
Reg. No. 51,419